REMARKS

Following entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1 to 9, 11 to 13, 18, 19, and 21 will be pending in the application. Claim 21 has been amended, and claims 20 and 22 to 27 have been cancelled, herein, without prejudice. No new claims have been added. Claims 1 to 9, 11 to 13, 18, and 19 have been withdrawn from consideration as drawn to non-elected subject matter.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of record in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Alleged Lack of Enablement

Claims 20 to 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement because undue experimentation would allegedly be required to practice the methods encompassed by the claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because those skilled in the art could make and use the full scope of the subject matter recited in amended claim 21 without undue experimentation.

Preliminarily, Applicants note that claims 20 and 22 to 27 have been canceled, obviating the rejection with respect to those claims. Claim 21 has been amended to recite methods for the therapeutic therapy of colorectal cancer, prostate cancer, small cell lung cancer, non-small cell lung cancer, breast cancer, pancreatic cancer, renal cancer, gastric cancer, bladder cancer or ovarian cancer. Support for the amendments is found throughout the specification as originally filed, including, for example, page 12, line 27, and page 12, lines 4 to 6.

The specification demonstrates that compounds of formula (I) are potent heparanase and angiogenesis inhibitors. Specifically, the specification describes assays in which the concentration of compounds of formula (I) necessary to achieve a 50 % inhibition in heparanase activity (IC_{50}s) was determined.[1] IC_{50} values for compounds of the examples ranged from 0.3 to 7.0 μM.[2] The specification also describes assays in which the concentration of compounds of formula (I) necessary to achieve a 50 % inhibition in

[1] Page 24, lines 1 to 17 and page 25, lines 6 to 17.
[2] Page 25, lines 6 to 17.

angiogenesis (IC_{50}s) was determined, and IC_{50} values for compounds of the examples ranged from 0.2 to 20.0 μM.[3]

Moreover, heparanase inhibitors have been demonstrated to be effective in animal models against tumor metastasis,[4] and angiogenesis inhibitors have been demonstrated to be effective anti-cancer agents.[5]

A correlation thus exits between the heparanase and angiogenesis inhibitory activity of the claimed compounds and treatment of the cancers recited in present claim 21. Undue experimentation would therefore not be required to practice the claimed methods, and Applicants accordingly, respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Alleged Indefiniteness

Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite for recitation of "of prodrug thereof," rather than "or prodrug thereof," which was an inadvertent typographical error. Claim 20 has been canceled, obviating the rejection. Applicants accordingly, respectfully request withdrawal thereof.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the foregoing constitutes a complete and full response to the Office action of record. An early and favorable action is accordingly, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 1, 2007

/Jane E. Inglese/
Jane E. Inglese, Ph.D.
Registration No. 48,444

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre 2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439

---

[3] Page 24, line 18 to page 25, line 17.
[4] Vlodavsky, *et al.*, *Invasion Metastasis*, 1994, 14, 290-302 and Parish, *et al.*, *Cancer Res.*, 1999, 59, 3433-41 (attached as Exhibits A and B, respectively).
[5] Herbst, R.S., *Expert Opin. Emerg. Drugs*, 2006, 11(4), 635-650 (attached as Exhibit C).